REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1 and 4-9 remain pending in the above-identified application, with claims 1 and 7-9 standing ready for further action on the merits and remaining claims 4-6 being withdrawn from further consideration based on an earlier restriction requirement.

In the instant amendment, claims 1 and 9 are amended. The amendments made to claim 1 are supported by the present specification, specifically by the disclosures on page 6, lines 17-19 and page 10, lines 3-12. Claim 9 is amended to correct a minor typographical error.

Accordingly, the present amendments to the claims do not introduce new matter into the application as originally filed. Further, the instant amendment does not raise substantial new issues for the Examiner's consideration nor does it require further search on the Examiner's part. At the same time, the instant amendments place the pending claims in condition for allowance and into a more proper format for issuance in a United States patent, by overcoming all outstanding rejections and objections of record.

As such entry of the instant amendment and favorable action on the merits are earnestly solicited at present.

Claim Objection

The Examiner has objected to claim 9 because of an informality (*i.e.*, typographical error). In order to overcome this objection, Applicants have amended claim 9 in order to correct the deficiency pointed out by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 7, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Jordan et al. US '267** (US 5,779,267) in view of **Koyama JP '472** (JP-A No. 2001-171472). This rejection is respectfully traversed based on the following considerations. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested hereto.

Nonobviousness over the Cited References

The present invention is directed to a filter for a gas generator. More specifically, claim 1 is currently amended to read, as follows:

> 1. A filter for a gas generator, comprising:
>
> a single metal wire comprising a core wire of iron and a coating layer of copper, the coating layer of copper being molten and plated on the core wire,
>
> the single metal wire being wound into a tubular shape having intersecting parts of the single metal wire, wherein
>
> thickness of the coating layer on the core is from 0.5 μm to 10 μm, and
>
> at each of the intersecting parts of the single metal wire, adjacent parts of the core are firmly fixed each other via the coating layer, wherein
>
> the thickness of the coating layer at the intersecting parts is thicker than the remaining portion of the single metal wire, and
>
> the adjacent parts of the core are firmly fixed each other by melting the coating layer of copper and infiltrating all of the molten copper into gaps of the intersecting parts.

It is alleged in the Office Action that **Jordan et al. US '267** discloses a thickness of 0.0003-0.015 inches (7.62-381 μm) for the copper coating, and **Koyama JP '472** teaches a heating treatment to concentrate copper into intersecting parts.

However, the thickness allegedly disclosed in **Jordan et al. US '267** is the coating thickness of the deflector member (*e.g.*, see column 5, line 6), which is different from a filter. Regarding the coating thickness of the filter, **Jordan et al. US '267** discloses in line 56, column 4, that the coating thickness of the filter is 0.0005-0.01 inches (12.7-254 μm).

Therefore, **Jordan et al. US '267** fails to disclose or suggest the claimed thickness of the coating layer (*i.e.*, 0.5 μm to 10 μm).

Further, in **Jordan et al. US '267**, the coating is provided for the protection of the filter. Accordingly, the coating layer of copper needs to cover the entire filter. On the other hand, in the claimed filter of the present invention, copper concentrates on the intersecting parts of the wire in order to enhance the strength of the filter. In this regard, the claimed invention is quite different from **Jordan et al. US '267**.

Similarly, the secondary reference **Koyama JP '472** also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed structural features of the present invention.

Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established based on the combination of **Jordan et al. US '267** and **Koyama JP '472**. Likewise, there is no rationale and/or reasonable expectation of success based on the combination of the cited references, by which one skilled in the art could arrive at the present invention as claimed.

Based on the foregoing considerations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the amendments and remarks presented herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to issue a Notice of Allowance clearly indicating that each of the pending claims is allowed.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Toyohiko Konno, Registration No. 68,859, at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: MAR 15 2012

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000